

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/776,937 | 06/17/1999 | Andrew D. Flockhart | 15-19-1 7315 | |
| 7590 02/25/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| David Volejnicek, Esq. | | | DAS, CHAMELI | |
| Avaya Inc. 307 Middletown-Lincroft Road | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Room 1N-391 | | | 2122 | 18 |
| Locroft, NJ 07738 | | | DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004 | 10 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| • | 09/776,937 | FLOCKHART ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Action | · | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Examiner C.DAS | 2122 | | | | |
| Th MAILING DATE of this communication appe | | | | | | |
| | | • | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 03 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | void abandonment of this applice i) a timely filed amendment whi | cation. A proper reply to a chiple ch | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). | isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of | f the final rejection. | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dail have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleaned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or | in better form for appeal by mat | erially reducing or simplifying the | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE: | ing a corresponding number of | finally rejected claims. | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection. | ction(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly | | | | | | |
| raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. | | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | proved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant's argument filed on 2/3/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In the remark, the applicant has argued in substance that Beck (US 6,332,154) does not teach that "customized wizard executes in the communication center, not in client's computer". Beck discloses that customized wizard (computer application program) executes in the client's computer (Beck, col 5 lines 35-37, "a wizard is periodically automatically updated in available information according to client transaction history") and (Beck, col 62, lines 66-67, "that wizard 423 be up-dated with the appropriate options and pre-scripted messages"), (Beck col 63, lines 1-20, " A desktop interface ... drivers may also be downloaded to a client's browser through desktop interface", where the updated wizard is the customized computer program and it is installed in the module and this module is downloaded into the client's computer, it clearly shows that the customized application program (wizard) is executed in the client's computer.

Chambi C-Don

CHAMELI C. DAS PRIMARY EXAMINER

2/20/04